IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANTONY DOMINIC

WEDNESDAY, THE 14TH NOVEMBER 2007 / 23RD KARTHIKA 1929

RP.No. 1091 of 2007(M)

AGAINST THE JUDGEMENT IN WPC.30995/2005 Dated 19/09/2007

.....

REVIEW PETITIONERS/RESPONDENTS IN THE WP(C):

1. THE VICE CHANCELLOR,
MAHATMA GANDHI UNIVERSITY, PRIYADARSHINI HILLS P.O
ATHIRAMPUZHA, KOTTAYAM DISTRICT.

2. THE CONTROLLER OF EXAMINATION,
MAHATMA GANDHI UNIVERSITY, PRIYADARSHINI HILLS P.O
ATHIRAMPUZHA, KOTTAYAM DISTRICT.

3. MAHATMA GANDHI UNIVERSITY,
PRIYADARSHINI HILLS P.O., ATHIRAMPUZHA,
KOTTAYAM DISTRICT, REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR.

4. THE CONVENER,
EXAMINATION COMMITTEE, MAHATMA GANDHI UNIVERSITY,
PRIYADARSHINI HILLS P.O., ATHIRAMPUZHA,
KOTTAYAM DISTRICT.

5. THE PRINCIPAL,
SCHOOL OF COMMUNICATION & INFORMATION SCIENCE,
MAHATMA GANDHI UNIVERSITY,PRIYADARSHINI HILLS P.O.
ATHIRAMPUZHA, KOTTAYAM DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.T.A.SHAJI

RESPONDENTS: PETITIONER IN THE WP(C):

THUSHARAM M.S., D/O. P.K. SASI,
MALAKUNNEL HOUSE, KOOTHATTUKULAM P.O.,KOZHIPPILLY,
ERNAKULAM DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI. C.C. THOMAS

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 14/11/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

ANTONY DOMINIC , J

==========

R.P. No. 1091 of 2007

in

W.P.(C). NO. 30995 OF 2005

==========

Dated this the 14th day of November, 2007.

**ORDER**

The writ petition was disposed of by judgment dated 19.09.2007 recording the submissions made by the Standing Counsel for the University which was satisfactory to the petitioner. Now this review has been filed for modifying the 2nd sentence in the 1st paragraph of the judgment.

2. It is submitted that it was not intended to convey that if the petitioner passes the B.L.I.Sc examination now, she will be permitted to maintain the results of the post graduate course which she had already successfully completed.

3. I see no justification in the stand now taken by the University. Even if the submission was not made, on the facts of this case, I would have passed a direction to that effect. This is for the reason that it was acting upon the result declared by the University that the petitioner had sought for and obtained admission for the P.G. course which she has successfully

completed. It was only much thereafter that the University took a stand that the result declared was erroneous. At this distance of time, I am not inclined to say that the petitioner should, in addition to the examination of B.L.I.Sc, also appear for M.L.I.Sc examination once again. Even otherwise the University should not be allowed to play with the future of the students in this manner.

The review petition lacks merits and the same is dismissed.

**ANTONY DOMINIC, JUDGE.**

rv